

Q12: For clarity purposes, when you refer to a “custom solution” are you actually meaning a “configured solution”? If this is not the case, then is the focus primarily on a COTS scanning or document management system VERSUS a COTS Registry Solution?

A12: By “custom solution” we mean code written to satisfy our business requirements. We did not mean configurable COTS solution, although we will evaluate solutions that incorporate COTS components.

Q13: Will a COTS Registry Solution VERSUS a custom build be scored equally?

A13: Yes.

Q14: Can you provide the anticipated budget for this?

A14: No.

Q15: There is no reference to COTS Product Licensing/Ongoing S&M structure. If vendors are proposing a COTS solution how will Cost Proposals versus a Custom Build be evaluated or assessed?

A15: Vendors are asked to report all license fees required to accommodate their proposal. OSOS will amend the RFP section 3.4 Cost Proposal for inclusion of license fees for implementation and 5 years post deployment.

OSOS will also amend the Cost Proposal section for inclusion of applicable support and maintenance fees for 5 years.

Both licensing and support and maintenance fees will be included in the total cost formula for scoring.

Please see section 1.2 Objective, paragraph 1, last sentence: “It will also be a scalable solution that the OSOS can easily modify as requirements evolve post deployment.” OSOS must be able to modify the code in house post-deployment to support ongoing system enhancements and law changes.

Q16: Is OSOS open to leveraging the vendors implementation methodology?

A16: Yes. Please see RFP section 3.2.A.

Q17: We like to request an extension for the final submission date, is this possible?

A17: Not at this time.

Q18: COTS are considered for modules of the system. Are there specific modules that Customized COTS would NOT be considered for?

A18: No.

Q19: Would the UI requirements be considered to be satisfied if the requirements are satisfied, but not follow the wireframes?

A19: Exceptions to the wireframes are permissible. However, the prescribed user experience must remain intact and OSOS branding must persist on all pages.

Q20: Are there expectations around productivity increased based on the system? What is the measure of success (e.g., decrease in time to process, increase in throughput, etc.)?

A20: Yes: 90% plus of Corporations and Charities OSOS filings completed online immediately upon submission without OSOS staff intervention within twelve months of system deployment. Presently approximately 28% of filings are completed online.

Q21: What is the current system of record for Customer/Orders/etc. all Data that is needed for this system

A21: The existing system is Oracle IBPM, originally Optika Acorde and was implemented in December of 2003. It is a first-generation system whose processes and procedures were modeled after manual equivalents in place at that time. It includes web filing for corporation and charity formations, a database, imaging of documents, and interfaces with the OSOS revenue system that was built in-house.

Q22: What are the requirements for historical data to be added to the system? How many historical transaction records are there anticipated to be? What is the volume of records that will be added to the system, Customer/Orders/etc.?

A22: Updated from preproposal conference: OSOS will amend the RFP to envelope data conversion and migration into the development project. Two new exhibits will be posted: 1) containing conversion and migration specifications 2) the existing data model.

Q23: How many transactions are expected based on current volumes?

A23: Approximately 250,000 per year.

Q24: What is the historical trend for increase in data or transactions?

A24: Historically 2-4% increase per year.

Q25: What are the PCI compliance requirements for the system? How are the payments posted (and which system) to settle the credit card transactions? What is the current Credit Card transaction system?

A25: The Corporations and Charities system will interface with the Office's existing credit card processing system (Cybersource) and revenue receipting system (OSOS built). OSOS anticipates that the two existing systems will enforce PCI compliance however, we look to vendors to provide their advisement on this matter.

Q26: How many reports are expected to be required? What are the types of reports that would be required (relationships), can you provide samples of the reports needed?

A26: The number of reports has not been determined. OSOS will work with the awarded vendor to clearly define reporting requirements. We expect flexible reporting for all data points captured from customers. Likewise, we expect flexible reporting for management and system optimization.

Q27: Is the assumption correct that there are 3 Interfaces, Wizard, Advanced and Staff Console?

A27: Yes.

Q28: Is the assumption correct that Wizard and Advanced are Consumer facing and Staff Console is internal?

A28: Yes.

Q29: What happens if a user doesn't close their batches for the day?

A29: We require that supervisors have authority to close out staff's batches in the case that a staff member abandons their batch before closing.

Q30: Shouldn't fee waivers be tracked as credits instead of notes on changed fees?

A30: OSOS agrees with this assessment.

Q31: How are dependencies between filings defined?

A31: OSOS requests clarification to this question.

Q32: Can users print documents queued by other users? In general, can users work on other user's items, etc.?

A32: External, no. Internal, yes.

Q33: What if customer calls and the item hasn't even been entered yet? How does the user capture the correction?

A33: The OSOS intention is that the majority of transactions will happen online. However, in the case of paper filings, there is no expectation that a mechanism exist to modify/correct an order/transaction in advance of the order/transaction being received.

Q34: Appendix K says internal users will be from Active Directory (and group membership will be leveraged). Is there a coupling with the AD and users managed?

A34: Yes.

Q35: How much auditing is required of user actions?

A35: We currently track changes in historical record tables. We expect this capability in the new system as well. All transactions filed will be logged to some degree. That is how we troubleshoot problems now and I don't see that changing in the future.

Q36: Any regulations around storing/securing?

A36: The filings will become part of the public record and we expect them to be preserved. Washington State law has a very expansive view of public records and their retention.

Q37: Metadata "defines things", but is there going to be tooling around how the metadata is managed?

A37: OSOS requests clarification to this question.

Q38: Assuming the system will need to be able to manage items with previous meta-data definitions and keep them valid, while new items use the new meta data once entered. Can meta data be changed on items that are in mid-flight?

A 38: OSOS requests clarification to this question.

Q39: Staff Console could be a superset of the Customer Web experience? So customers and internal users use the same UI?

A39: Yes, the staff console is a superset of the public user interface, in that the staff console includes all fields of the public user interface plus a few additional fields. Yes, staff and the public could use the same UI, with the addition of the unique fields for staff use. However, the staff console must be optimized for efficiency, rapid and ergonomic data entry. There should also be a distinguishing characteristic of the staff console so that staff can clearly see which UI they are operating in.

Q40: What does the onboarding process of partners and affiliates look like?

A40: This has not been fully defined yet. An API will be exposed so that a customer can create their own process to push data into our system. We do not anticipate a significant volume of partners or affiliates – DOR is our primary. OSOS will work with the awarded vendor to define this process.

Q41: Once onboard, how will authentication/authorization be handled? OAuth only? Are there PII regulations to consider during data transfers?

A41: OSOS will work with the awarded vendor to define this process. OSOS will not support this service for Trusts (which may contain PII). Therefore, there are not PII regulations to consider as all other information managed by OSOS is public record.

Q42: A project schedule is requested in the RFP. To what level of detail do you request sprint scheduling to be defined?

A42: OSOS would like to learn from the vendor what methodology will be used to determine sprints and approximately how many sprints, of what duration, the vendor anticipates. OSOS PM will work with the vendor PM to develop a more detailed timeline and plan of approach upon project launch. Detail provided in the vendor's proposal should provide OSOS with detail enough to understand the approach intended and convey the vendor's expertise in managing such a development project.

Q43: In regards to architecture, how tied to the defined architecture is OSOS? Is OSOS open to different architecture options? For example, would a SQL database in place of Mongo be acceptable?

A43: Yes, we are open to different architecture options, but the proposed solution must integrate well with our existing Active Directory configuration. Vendors are asked to report all license fees required to accommodate their proposal. OSOS will amend the RFP section 3.4 COST PROPOSAL for specifications regarding license fees.

Q44: Are there anticipated changes to legislation throughout the next year?

A44: Yes. There is a new law effective Jan 1, 2016 called HUB. Which is a uniform law that pulls all provisions of business entities supported by OSOS Corporations and Charities into one chapter. It does not make a lot of changes to what we've documented with the exception of registered agent, especially the creation of a commercial registered agent. We will be required to maintain a directory of commercial registered agents upon HUB implementation January 1, 2016.

Q45: What amount of support is available from OSOS resources?

A45: Lead Developer, 75%, Project Manager, approximately 50%. Other resources, development/technical support and business subject matter experts will be made available as necessary to support a successful project. Vendors are encouraged to identify what level of support they require from OSOS resources to aid OSOS in securing the required support in advance.

Q46: Why not a customizable COTS?

A46: OSOS is interested in a Lean solution. We do not want an overbuilt solution. We plan to support the implemented solution in house. Having said that, we will consider systems with COTS components.

Q47: Does the State expect FRD, TDD, and RTM deliverables from the chosen vendor?

A47: OSOS has not prescribed requirements for a functional requirement document, test-driven development or requirements trace matrix.

Q48: Is training in the scope for this development project? If so, how many users? How many system administrators? Is the State interested in a "Train-the-Trainer" method?

A48: No. Training is not in scope for this development project.

Q49: Is data conversion in the scope for this project? If so, what is the size of the data? How many databases? How many tables? Would the State consider providing a Visio document with the data model?

A49: OSOS will amend the RFP to envelope data conversion and migration into the development project. A new exhibit will be posted to define conversion and migration requirements

Q50: What level of on-site presence is required?

A50: See answer to Q3 in Amendment 1: There are no specific requirements for onsite time. It is expected that the vendor plan for onsite time as necessary to complete a successful project, but no specifics are defined.

Q51: Have business rules been completed for this effort? If yes, will those business rules be provided to the bidding party?

A51: Yes. Please see exhibits C, D, E, F, G and I for documentation depicting business requirements.

Q52: Will they be provided prior to the proposal due date? If business rules have been created and will not be made available to the bidding party, will the vendor that created the business rules be excluded from bidding this RFP?

A52: Yes. Please see exhibits C, D, E, F, G and I.

Q53: Is documentation available that describes the Secure Access Washington system?

A53: Please see the CTS website for details available on Secure Access Washington:  
<http://cts.wa.gov/products/security/secureAccessWashington.aspx>.

Q54: In reviewing the RFP, can you provide additional information as to the state's goal/requirement as it relates to Exhibit C in the RFP?

A54: Exhibit C is a service catalog. The original file formatted incorrectly. Please see the updated file.

Q55: Would the state like to have a transactional database to track history/changes?

A55: Yes.

Q56: We assume that the state would require the system to be ADA compliant, please confirm?

A56: Confirmed.

Q57: There are seven processes identified as “displayed for all that are eligible”, please define which business entities are eligible for these processes?

- a. Conversion
- b. Merger
- c. Administration Dissolution
- d. Administration Cancellation
- e. Change Registered Agent/Office
- f. Resignation of Registered Agent

A57: This detail is provided in the service catalog, please see updated Exhibit C.

Q58: Is data migration a part of the scope? If not, is the bidder to assume that the system will go live with no historical data? If yes, can the data model for the existing system be made available to bidders for proposal purposes?

A58: OSOS will amend the RFP to envelope data conversion and migration into the development project. A new exhibit will be posted to define conversion and migration requirements

Q59: Is there an existing system that the state would like to see integration points with? If yes, can the state provide the vendor name that created the system and can the state provide integration points with that system?

A59: Yes. The corporations and charities replacement system must interface with DOR-BLS (Department of Revenue, Business Licensing System), which will be replaced by a new DOR system at approximately the same time the OSOS deploys the new Corporations and Charities filing system. The corporations and charities system must also interface with the OSOS Revenue System, which was developed by OSOS and Cybersource for credit card payment processing.

Q60: Does the state currently use a credit card payment processor? If yes, can the bidder use the existing processor?

A60: Yes. We currently use Cybersource. It is expected that our Cybersource deployment will remain intact.

Q61: How is Kofax Scan installed? Does the state have access to the APIs?

A61: It is a local server install. Yes, OSOS has access to the APIs.

Q62: Is a user guide, technical administration manual, and/or training documentation of OSOS staff of the existing system available to bidders?

A62: A technical Admin manual is available and reasonably accurate. OSOS will include the manual as a new exhibit.

Q63: Does the vendor have to build a system that allows the generation of letters and/or emails using both boiler plate and customizable text? If yes, do you require the system to store the letter images once generated? If yes, how does the state want the data to be stored?

A63: Yes. Yes. Letters must be stored in as a pdf original form in a manner such that they are retrievable by the public (for all entities except Trusts) via the public site. Trusts letters must be retrievable by staff in a similar fashion.

Q64: Exhibit D page 228 presents a listing of possible report categories. On pages 229-235 possible reports under each of the categories is presented. Is this representative of the system reporting requirements?

A64: OSOS will work with the awarded vendor to clearly define reporting requirements. The list referenced is a summary list of report types and not complete.

Q65: Per Amendment 2 Q&A, Question 2, has the vendor that designed the external UI specification or the vendor who designed the internal UI built a full corporations system in another state?

A65: This questions is declined as it does not pertain to our project, RFP or RFP process.

Q66: Is there a forum in place for national or international vendors to identify potential local sub-contractors?

A66: The OSOS is not aware of any such forum. Washington Department of Enterprise Services might be able to provide additional information if any state-supported forum exists:  
<http://www.des.wa.gov/Pages/default.aspx>.